

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
HAMMOND DIVISION

MICHAEL RUFFIN EL,

Plaintiff,

V.

**BRUCE PARENT, LAKE COUNTY, and
McCOLLY REAL ESTATE,**

Defendants.

2:23CV160-PPS/JEM

OPINION AND ORDER

On September 6, 2023, I issued an opinion granting motions to dismiss this case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, and the Clerk entered judgment accordingly, closing the case. [DE 36, 37.] Since then, the pro se plaintiff has left a voicemail message with my chambers, sent many emails to the chambers mailbox, and made many new filings in the record of the case.

Attempts to communicate with the court by telephone, off the record and without the knowledge and participation of opposing parties, is inappropriate with respect to substantive matters relating to litigation before me. Ruffin El's voicemail message contained substantive argument concerning his case, and will be entirely disregarded. Similarly, litigants may generally use the chambers email box only to submit proposed orders (careful to copy all opponents) or as expressly directed by the court. Although the subject line of several of Ruffin El's emails refer to a "Proposed Order," the content is no such thing. Ruffin El's submissions to the chambers email box inappropriately sidestep the official record of the case and will also be disregarded.

The number of filings by Ruffin El since the entry of judgment, similar to his earlier filings, do not present coherent legal or factual argument and also fail to comply with a number of procedural requirements applicable to court filings. Several of the documents refer to Fed.R.Civ.P. 60(b), a motion for relief from judgment. [DE 40, 41, 42.] Because no basis is shown for reconsideration of my previous dispositive analysis, all such motions will be denied.

Proceedings in this court are concluded. Ruffin El is free to seek an appeal if he wishes to advocate that there has been any reversible error in the handling of his case. All future inappropriate emails and telephone calls from Ruffin El will be disregarded. The Court will take no action on any future filings in the court record that fail to comply with applicable procedural requirements and/or fail to present coherent factual or legal argument.

ACCORDINGLY:

Plaintiff Michael Ruffin El's Notices citing Rule 60(b)(1) [DE 40, 41, 42], to the extent they may be CONSTRUED as motions for relief from judgment, are DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

ENTERED: September 27, 2023.

/s/ Philip P. Simon
PHILIP P. SIMON, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT